

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Claim Amendments

Claims 1-19, 21-26, 28, and 44 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 44 being independent claims. Claims 1, 8, 9, 15, 22, and 44 are amended herein.

Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 44 are amended to delete the “whereby” clauses recited on lines 11-13, 12-14, 11-13, 11-13, and 9-11, respectively. In addition, claim 8 is amended to delete the words “angle indicator” as a modifier of “arms.” This amendment to claim 8 was inadvertently not included in the October 21, 2002 Amendment and Response. Dependent claim 9 is amended to add a period at the end of the claim.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-19, 21-26, 28, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In the Office action, it is asserted that the “whereby” clauses in claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 44 recited on lines 11-13, 12-14, 11-13, 11-13, and 9-11, respectively, make it unclear whether or not the bowling ball is being claimed. Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-19, 21, 23-26, and 28 are rejected due to their dependency on independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, respectively.

As described above, the “whereby” clauses recited in claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 44 are deleted by this Amendment to eliminate any possible confusion resulting from function recited in the deleted “whereby” clauses. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 44 as amended show that a bowling ball is not claimed.

For at least these reasons, it is believed that claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 44 are no longer indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and such indication is earnestly requested. For the same reasons, claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-19, 21, 23-26, and 28 are no longer indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, because claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-19, 21, 23-26, and 28 depend from and include the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, respectively.

Application No. 09/873,111
Reply to Office action of July 21, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 11028US.00
Express Mail No. EV 410 060 185 US

III. Conclusion

For at least the reasons discussed herein, it is believed that claims 1-19, 21-26, 28, and 44 are in form for allowance, and such indication is respectfully requested.

A petition for a one month extension of time to respond to the July 21, 2003 Office action is hereby requested, making this Amendment and Response due on or before Friday, November 21, 2003. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 04-1415 the amount of \$55.00 to cover the extension of time fee and \$180.00 to cover the fee under 37 C.F.R.

§ 1.17(p) for the enclosed Information Disclosure Statement. It is believed no further fees are due with respect to filing of this Amendment; however, if any application processing fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 04-1415.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Date: November 21, 2003

By Lee R. Osman
Lee R. Osman
Attorney Reg. No. 38,260
PH: (303) 629-3400
Customer No. 20686